



City Of Granite Shoals
2221 N. Phillips Ranch Road
Granite Shoals, TX 78654
Phone (830) 598-2424 fax (830) 598-6538
www.graniteshoals.org

MEETING MINUTES
CITY OF GRANITE SHOALS, TX
REGULAR CALLED CITY COUNCIL MEETING
CITY HALL, 2ND FLOOR COUNCIL CHAMBER, GRANITE SHOALS, TX
TUESDAY, JULY 26, 2016
6:00 PM

The numbering below tracks that of the agenda, whereas the actual order of consideration may have varied.

1. Mayor Brugger called the regular meeting of the City Council of the City Of Granite Shoals to order at 6:00 PM, Granite Shoals City Hall, Council Chamber, 2221 N. Phillips Ranch Road, Granite Shoals, Texas.

Present:

Carl Brugger, Mayor
Anita Hisey, Council Member, Plc. 1
Shirley King, Council Member, Plc. 2
Eric Tanner, Council Member, Plc. 3
Tom Dillard, Mayor Pro Tem
Todd Holland, Council Member, Plc. 5
Mark Morren, Council Member, Plc 6

Absent:

City Staff Present:

Ken Nickel, City Manager
Peggy Smith, Assistant City Manager
Brad Young, City Attorney
Elaine Simpson, City Secretary
Interim Chief of Police Gary Boshears

2. Randy Taylor of the First Baptist Church and the Granite Shoals Faith Alliance gave the invocation.

3. Pledge to the US and the Texas State Flags, respectively.

4. Presentations, Recognitions and Reports:

a.) Quarterly Report from Granite Shoals Municipal Court: Judge Frank Reilly:

MUNICIPAL COURT QUARTERLY REPORT

April - June 2016

Open Cases at beginning of Quarter: 600

New Cases Filed (opened):

Traffic	105
State Law	17
City Ordinance	24
Total	146

Disposition of cases closed:

Uncontested at Window	87	56%
Dismissed by Prosecutor	18	12%
Bench Trial / Jury Trial	1	1%
Community Service / Jail Credit	22	14%
Driver Safety Course	9	6%
Compliance	18	12%
Total	155	

TOTAL OPEN CASES:7/1/2016: 591

AJ Deferred Disposition 9

AP Appealed 17

AW Arrest Warrant 249

CD Driving Safety Due 12

CP Capias Pro Fine 113

CS Community Service 1

EA Code Arraignment 9

ED Extension Default 9

EX 30-Day Extension 12

FL Follow Up 9

IA Initial Arraignment 51

LN Late Notice 19

PP Payment Plan 41

PT Pre-Trial 3

SC Show Cause 27

591

PENDING COMPLETION OF PAYMENT PLAN:10

WARRANTS:

Issued	69
Executed (served)	25

REVENUE:

TO CITY	\$	20,365.41
TO STATE	\$	7,044.52
NON-CASH CREDITS	\$	7,360.30

b.) Update/Report from the Airport Advisory Committee: Chair Neil Haverlah:

AIRPORT ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORT TO CITY COUNCIL-JULY 26, 2016
PRESENTED BY NEIL HAVERLAH-COMMITTEE CHAIR

This committee was established by City Council to maintain operational data and gather information on the airport to develop plans for maintenance, improvements, and future sources of revenue and uses of the airport. Review planning and zoning to ensure compatibility with the City's Comprehensive Plan and report to the city Council per ORD 686. Our Council Liaison is Mayor Pro Tem Tom Dillard.

First meeting was held April 14, 2016. Nominations were made and passed to elect:
Neil Haverlah- Chair, David Dittmar-Vice chair, Sheryl Gardner-Secretary

In this organizing meeting we discussed and looked at zoning maps, airport map, airplane tie-down locations, possible sources of revenue and future items- Beacon, radio communication to coordinate with Sunrise Beach Airport, and need for signs.

May12 Meeting,

Reviewed Bob Sylvester's detailed drawing of the airport and discussed education and promotion of the airport, zoning issues.

The committee created a collection of priorities:

Education/Promotion of the Airport

Dispel misconceptions

Airport Directory listings / Naming Airport / Branding Airport

Zoning Regulations for Hangar Homes

Overlay District?

What restrictions exist that prevent Hangar Homes?

Cut Costs and Recoup Costs for Operation of the Airport

Improve facilities and processes

Generate Revenue

Fuel

Hangars / Tie-downs

Long-Term Planning

Longer Runway - 3200' ?

Committee Projects

Signage

Run Up Pad

Gravel to mitigate the standing water problem

'Whitewash' the lights
Sludge Dump?
Accurate survey / inventory (tools) Possibly GIS mapping?

Clarity on Public/Private
FAA / State money availability
Send recommendations to City Council

Record Keeping (improving operations)

Tasks- review codes concerning Hangar Houses and past budgets for the airport.

June 9 Meeting

Discussed physical needs of the airport- maintenance, improvements, mowing, fuel tank/pump, Federal rules to remove the "Private" airport designation to encourage use. Motion made and passed to recommend to City Council to change the designator to "publicly owned, no permission needed to land".

Discussed budget request for 2017. Passed the motion made by Jeff Hunt of the Budget Sub-Committee to submit a budget of \$3500.

Discussed Hangar Houses and the GS Zoning that applies to the airport adjacent properties and proposed a meeting with the code enforcement personnel to be coordinated with Ken Nichols before next committee meeting.

Discussed priorities and rankings-leaving record keeping as lowest for now.

July 14 Meeting

Open meeting with citizen input from Virgil Yanta Sr. and Jr. Re-iterated zoning requirements for building and tree height to be enforced, need to spruce up the airport and surrounding areas,

and zone for hangar houses on both sides. His comments also included the need for run-up areas to have provision to keep gravel out of the prop during engine testing/run-up. His comments were duly noted as he has been a potential property buyer

Reviewed and renumbered the priorities. Discussed implementation of the top ones.

Discussion on meeting with zoning personnel about hangar houses. The revised rules allow the concept of hangar houses and / or large garages.

c.) Geographic Information Services (GIS) software demonstration: Assistant City Manager Peggy Smith

Assistant City Manager Smith presented, via internet link, Mr. Will Dugger from Jacob and Martin Engineering of Abilene, to discuss and demonstrate the GIS software. Mr. Dugger spoke via phone for the audio and remotely controlled the GIS software on the city's laptop for the 'video' portion of the presentation. He explained that the maps in GIS are layers which can focus on any particular item, there can be a map of the locations of water meters, of 2-inch water lines, of streets, of properties (tied-in to the Burnet Central Appraisal District to provide the information on owners of properties in the city) and there can be a layer created by the Police Department to map the homes of Sex Offenders from the registry.

Mr. Dugger explained that the maps are based on database information, so the maps can provide illustrations for City Council related to needs for the Capital Programs and Comprehensive Plans, to illustrate where new infrastructure is, or is needed. He explained how this GIS can be used for Economic Development purposes. He noted that City Secretaries often utilize this for zoning cases when notifications must be sent to residents the site of a re-zoning request.

The presentation ended with Ms. Smith explaining that at this point city staff is putting new data related to locations of water valves into the system. This information will be available on laptops or pad computers and will replace the outdated 'paper maps' currently used for this information. This will reduce 'pipe leak repair' time significantly.

5. Public comment and announcements and Items of Interest

- Nomination Period for the 2017 John Rinehart Memorial Award for Outstanding Community Service, June 30th through September 30th, applications available at City Hall and on the city website at <http://www.graniteshoals.org/DocumentCenter/View/687>
- Traffic Count requested from Texas Department of Transportation for Prairie Creek and RR 1431. (Mayor Brugger)

Mayor Brugger announced the above Items of Interest. He noted that TXDOT has responded to his request and have agreed to conduct the traffic count on RR 1431 to determine if there is need for a traffic control (red light) at this arterial.

1.) Roy Settlemyre, 1501 Ridge Valley: Spoke regarding concerns about the 2004 annexation of the 'Green Valley' area. He disagrees with the City Attorney's opinion that this annexation was done correctly. He brought a sign he made that says '43.033 GS – GV Annex Fraud'. He believes that Section 43.033 of State Law dealing with municipal annexation was not correctly followed in 2004, and there were not sufficient number of residents in this area to be eligible for annexation.

2.) Michael Steenbergen, 2208 Belaire Drive, Granite Shoals, TX:
Tuesday, July 26, 2016, Pursuant to Public Comments under Agenda Item (5),
Honorable Mayor Brugger and Honorable Council Members:

I speak once again on behalf of the Granite Shoals Citizens' Advisory Group. Please note that Lacy Mortenson Jr. was elected President of our organization on Saturday July 22, 2016 by a full quorum of founding membership. The vote was 4 to 0 and I, Michael Steenbergen, was also confirmed as Executive Secretary in the same resolution. Voting members were John Uitley, Linda Mueller Uitley, Lacy Mortenson Jr. and Michael Steenbergen. The group released the following statement: "The mission of the Granite Shoals Citizens' Advisory Group is to increase citizen participation in local government through awareness, education, and engagement."

The Granite Shoals Citizens' Advisory Group has organized a petition drive to call for a referendum by the voters on Ordinance No. 680 also known as the "No Deer Feeding Ordinance." We anticipate that the petition will be delivered to the City Secretary on or about Monday, August 1, 2016.

The Citizens' Advisory Group will again hold off on its review of the City staff responses to Citizen Action Requests for road and drainage repair until the next meeting. This is in deference to the current planned workshop on road project priorities and allocation. We will simply note there are signs of increased activity in road repair and preparation for future upgrades. We continue monitoring this progress and inspecting the repair sites and the new materials being used. Thank you. Michael L Steenbergen, Executive Secretary Granite Shoals Citizens' Advisory Group

6. MANAGEMENT REPORTS

a.) City Manager

- USDA Funding/Grant/Street Project status: Noted that the USDA Rural Development grant such as this is a 'long-term' project, and the grant requirements often necessitate the projects being multi-year. City staff has been working with Mr. Rick Flores at the USDA. The next item the city needs to get is an environmental study and preliminary engineering report. We have some bids already for the survey work. Staff has not yet reviewed these bids.
- Marble Falls ISD memorandum of agreement for soccer fields: We hope to have the school district signature on the agreement by the end of August. The soccer field will be built before September 2019. It is not expected to be constructed for this school year.
- Outdoor Recreation Grant Application for October 2016 / Quarry Park: Peal Engineering is working with city staff to evaluate different configurations for playing courts within the Granite processing outbuilding that we seek to repurpose. Peal Engineering is doing this for no charge. These drawings will go to Parks Committee and they will review them at their next meeting.

There was a brief discussion of the addition of bathrooms for Quarry Park being added to this grant request. Currently, Quarry Park is served by Porta Potties. City Staff estimates cost of a bathroom building to be approximately \$65,000.

- Budget Meetings: City Manager and Assistant City Manager have been meeting with Department Heads regarding their budget requests for the upcoming Fiscal Year.

There was a brief discussion of the 'Certified Appraisal Rolls, which were accompanied by a letter from Burnet Central Appraisal District Chief Appraiser Stan Hemphill and dated 7-23-2016. This letter is provided to all Council members at their place at the dais tonight, as it is the second item for the Consent Agenda to be considered tonight. There was a discussion that the certified rolls indicate that there is a 1.63% increase in the Taxable Value of property in the City Limits of Granite Shoals since 2015. This 1.63% increase is equal to \$7,488,012.00. (See Exhibit 'A' to these meeting minutes). At the next regular City Council meeting, the Council will receive the proposed budget from the City Manager.

- Volunteer Service – Church Youth project: There is a Service Project going on in the City of Granite Shoals at this time. The Youth from several churches, from Marble Falls, Granite Shoals, Llano and Burnet have combined and there are approximately 100 kids taking part in this service project. They plan to do some projects which benefit individuals in the community who are unable to do manual labor. They also plan to do some projects on the larger 'city' scale. They will paint at Veterans Park and at the Community Center. They will work on landscaping at some of the parks.

b.) Assistant City Manager

- Paving Project: Previously, the City Council approved the proposed Paving Plan for 2016. Burnet County Commissioners Court has approved the Interlocal agreement for the city to use their paving equipment. The proposed dates for the Paving Project are set for August 24-25th. The Street Department personnel have already been 'prepping' the streets included in the plan. The only thing which we plan to do differently is use banners to indicate to motorists when detours may be expected. Last year(s), city employees have gone door-to-door to hang 'door hangers' on the doors to let residents know when the paving would begin and end and which streets would be involved.

c.) City Secretary

- Upcoming City Council Training update: Council determined at the last meeting that they will rent a vehicle and not book rooms for the TML Annual Conference in October. Council Members who wish to attend the event can get registered at the 'Early Bird' price for online registration until August 30th; this is \$295 for Wed-Friday, or \$161.00 for a one-day registration. Please inform staff of your training plans if you have not already.
- Election Update:
 - Election Contract is already available for the City Council to adopt for the Burnet County Election Administrator to conduct elections in the 2016-2017 fiscal year. This contract will cover both Nov. 2016 and May 2017.
 - If a Referendum petition is received related to Ordinance 680 No Feeding of Deer, there is a possibility that a November Election will be required. As of today, the petition circulators have until August 25th to submit a petition. (The publication of the Ordinance caption in the Highlander is scheduled for July 22nd and July 26th. July 26th + 30 days = August 25th.) If a petition is received timely, there is a 21 day period for city staff to verify the petition, then two regular City Council meetings for the City Council to take action to call an election.

- Last day to call a bond election, or a referendum election, is Monday, August 22, 2016 for November 8, 2016 uniform election date.
- August 16, 2016 City meetings: The Planning and Zoning Commission recently moved their regularly scheduled meetings to the third Tuesday of each month. In August, there is a conflict between the P&Z Regular Meeting, and the City Council Budget Workshop. Council may, or may not, hold their August 16th Budget Workshop. There is nothing that must be done, statutorily, on this date.

Council determined by consensus that they would move the Budget Workshop to Monday, August 15th to be held at 6 PM.

7. CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

The items listed are considered to be routine and non-controversial by the City Council and will be approved by one motion, There will be no separate discussion of these items unless a Councilmember so requests, in which case the item will be removed from the Consent Agenda prior to a motion and vote. The item will be considered in its normal sequence of the regular agenda.

- Approve City Council minutes from July 12, 2016; Regular Meeting.
- Accept the Certified tax appraisal rolls (See Exhibit 'A' to these meeting minutes)

Council Member Tanner motioned, and Mayor Pro Tem Dillard seconded, to approve, as presented, the items on the Consent Agenda. Motion carried unanimously with a 7-0 vote.

8. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

- Discuss, consider and possibly take action related to the appointment of members to Boards and Committees. (City Secretary Simpson)

As there were no applications received for the Beautification Advisory Group (BAG), and that is the only Board or Committee with vacancies at this time, this item was not needed. No action was taken.

- Discuss, and consider a recommendation received from the Planning and Zoning Commission regarding proposed modifications to Granite Shoals Zoning Ordinance (City Code, Chapter 40) related to fencing in residential zoning districts. (City Manager Ken Nickel)

There was an extended discussion of the recommended changes sent to City Council from the Planning and Zoning Commission related to fencing.

There were brief discussions related to many topics of concern, including, but not limited to:

Concern related to safety, specifically related to density of building materials, and height. City Council members expressed concerns for motorists and for emergency first responders if solid walls are allowed to be built all around a structure, especially near the front lot line.

Concerns related to materials used which may not have strength to withstand weather and will not age well. These type fences, especially if they are constructed up to 8' tall, will likely become 'saggy' looking and may collapse.

Concerns regarding waterfront property owners having sufficient room on their property to also have security/privacy fence.

There was a discussion regarding the role of the Board of Adjustments (BOA) when a fence is constructed in the city which is not in compliance with the Zoning Ordinance. If there is a unique characteristic of the lot, the BOA may be able to allow a variance. If the property owners just wish to build higher, or use un-approved materials, then the BOA would not be able to grant a variance. The BOA could not grant a variance for aesthetics related to 'architectural' reasons.

Susie Hardy, Vice Chair of the Planning and Zoning Commission: explained that P&Z wanted to be sensitive to the desires of weekend home owners. These property owners might desire to have a higher privacy fence and lock the gate when they are not in town, for security reasons.

The City Council discussed at length that they would like no more than 25% density on the front lot line, or in the front setback.

There was a discussion of the need for 'Deer Proof' fencing for protection of food gardens.

Mr. Roy Settlemyre: Spoke regarding the need for fencing to protect his garden.

Mr. Steven Dooley: Member, P&Z Commission: Spoke as the owner of the original 'offending' garden fence. He noted concerns regarding the deer coming into the garden. That is why his family built a 'Garden Fence' out of raw natural cedar (not 'milled cedar' as required by the ordinance) up to a height of eight feet.

Ms. Linda Utley, Hummingbird Dr.: Spoke regarding her concerns for residents who cannot afford to build or maintain some fences. These people do not have the means.

Mr. Jim Davant, 310 S. Shorewood: Explained that he had attended the previous few P&Z Commission meetings and had been following this issue. He noted that when the P&Z previously discussed fencing, (and City Council discussed fencing) culminating in the Amending Ordinance to the Zoning Chapter of the city code last summer, the focus was not on special enclosures such as Garden Fences, it was on regular 'Lot Line' or 'Perimeter' fencing.

Mayor Brugger called a recess from 8:35 PM to 8:50 PM.

After some more extended discussion, the City Council determined that this is not ready to go into ordinance format and go forward for Public Hearings. The Council determined to send this back to the P&Z Commissioners with a list of six concerns which they would like to see addressed, before this goes forward to Public Hearing.

List of concerns/ideas:

- 1.) Front fencing set at full visibility, or no more than 25% density, instead of no more than 50% density. Full visibility may be achieved by having no more than 25% density, or, by reducing the height of the fence to five feet.
- 2.) Maximum height for perimeter fencing set at six feet (6'), for interior fencing eight feet (8').
- 3.) Any fence constructed in the front yard setback must be full visibility.
- 4.) There should be better definitions of perimeter fence versus interior fence.
- 5.) The list of materials allowed for building a perimeter fence should remain as it is; however, a list of allowed building materials for interior fences should be specified/established.
- 6.) A perimeter fence, if set back from the front lot line by 20 feet (20'), will be allowed to a height of six feet all around.

There was no formal motion/action.

9. WORKSHOP:

Arterial road improvements (Mayor Carl Brugger, City Manager Nickel) which may include discussion of any of the following topics or other issues related to a city Arterial Road Infrastructure Improvement Project, as discussed at July 12, 2016 Regular City Council meeting.

- a. Bond rates
- b. Construction costs
- c. Continuation of discussion of Mayor Brugger's list of 'Options' for Road Arterial Project, as discussed at previous two City Council meetings and the June 30, 2016 Meet With Mayor event.
- d. Elm Creek Drainage – in general and as relates to proposed improvements to Prairie Creek Drive.
- e. Financing Options.
- f. Alternative projects related to arterial road improvements
- g. Engineer update from Greg Haley
- h. Election issues related to bond project

See Mayor Brugger's handouts, attached as Exhibit 'B' to these meeting minutes. These include: 1.) Brad Young's memo regarding the various methods of funding road maintenance and construction (flat fee on the water bills not allowed, to assess a fee, must be tied to a road use formula designed by an engineer). 2.) Mayor Brugger's Tax Rate Impact Analysis version 26-July-16 , 3 pages. 3.) Mayor Brugger's Arterial Roads 2016, Alternative proposal(s) version dated 7-26-2016 with Cost and Road measurements from Greg Haley, KC Engineering (4 pages.)

Mayor Brugger started the workshop by opening all the discussion items a.) – h.).

Mr. Greg Haley, Engineer with KC Engineering, was present at the meeting, per Council request, to field questions, with him, he brought his colleague Martin Stary, P.E., a Senior Engineer with the firm.

There was an extended discussion related to various topics.

The cost projection figure of '\$162.00 per linear foot' is appropriate to Phillips Ranch Road, but would not be appropriate to use for Valley View.

The cost estimate of '\$16.00 per linear foot' is probably appropriate for 'ribbon curbing' (Phillips Ranch Road). There are plans to do standard curb and gutter for Prairie Creek Road, due to drainage issues discussed at previous meetings.

There was a discussion of the cost of doing the Road Infrastructure project in sections. Mr. Haley explained that the more involved the traffic control is, the more expensive the project.

There was a very brief discussion of Phillips Ranch Road and the possibility of installing sidewalks later in the distant future. This idea was met with concern, as engineers do not customarily build sidewalks next to ribbon curbing. It is not considered safe.

There were some discussions of possible ways to reduce project costs which included doing the 'survey' work block to block, instead of lot by lot. There was a discussion of the importance of topographical survey to assure that projections are accurate. The topographical survey is done as part of the overall engineering services. Discussion of things that can cause cost overruns were noted to include: storm drains, market volatility, gas lines (possibly two major gas lines in the City of Granite Shoals), and other unknown utilities in the area.

City Manager Nickel explained that the city has received some bids to do the survey work on this project. The bids have not yet been evaluated. This may need to be delayed. This survey work will cost approximately \$21,000.

These topics were discussed:

1.) Roads and Sections. There was general agreement among City Council that the Road Infrastructure Project should address all three (3) arterials. It was noted that on the Mayor's Alternative sheet, the options #3 and #4 addressed options for doing all three arterial streets, 'all the way'.

2.) Mayor Brugger clarified that his 10% contingency figure was acceptable to Mr. Haley.

3.) The discussion of the 'Monthly Fee' idea was discussed briefly. This would have the benefit of including residents who have their taxes 'frozen' to contribute to the financing of this project. This also would potentially provide the ability of the bonds to be for only 10 year payback. The negatives of this plan would be the need for an engineering study to 'tie' the road use to the fee charged. (see City Attorney discussion of this in Exhibit B) This study would be

complicated. Another drawback might be the perception of the tax payers that they are taking on two burdens; one on the tax bill and one on the water bill. There was also concern that some Senior citizens or Disabled residents who have taxes 'frozen' also live on tight 'fixed' incomes. Adding a road use fee to their water bill might be burdensome at worst, at best could prove to be difficult to explain. A very straightforward bond might be the easiest for the voters to understand.

4.) When to hold the bond election; November 2016 or May 2017? The Council members discussed the pros and cons of each of these uniform tax dates for holding the proposed Road Project bond election. There was an extended discussion of costs which will accrue before a bond election might be held, these include \$18,000 for an environmental survey and a possible \$37,000 for the Preliminary Engineering Report. There was an extended discussion related to the USDA Rural Development grant, and the possibility that a loan might be given as well. If a bond election is held and fails, it will take 3 years before the bond election can be held again. If there is voter interest in this project, the Council will feel more confident ordering these studies. If this election was 'rushed' however, and the voters were not presented enough information, they might vote the project down. There was a discussion that there will probably be higher voter turnout at this November 2016 presidential election than at the May 2017 City election. Council Members determined that Council Members King, Holland, Dillard and Mayor Brugger favored waiting until May of 2017. The other three Council members favored going forward in November. The May Election was accepted.

Mr. Michael Steenbergen: suggested that the City Council consider a larger bond for this project.

10. EXEC. SESSIONS:

Executive session pursuant to sections 551.074 of the Texas Open Meetings Act (Personnel Matters): Discussion regarding the appointment, employment, evaluation, reassignment, duties, discipline, or dismissal of the following public employees: City Manager Ken Nickel, City Secretary Elaine Simpson and Fire Chief Austin Stanphill. .

Any action(s) resulting from Executive Session(s).

Mayor Brugger recessed the Regular (Open) Meeting at 10:50 PM and convened the Exec. Session.

Mayor Brugger adjourned the Executive Session and reconvened the Open Meeting at 12:09 PM

Mayor Brugger motioned, Council Member Tanner seconded, to approve a pay increase for the City Secretary from annual salary of \$65,200 to \$66,500. Motion carried unanimously by a 7-0 vote.

11. Written Reports
 - a. Code
 - b. Fire
 - c. Streets / Parks
 - d. Police

Reports were accepted.

12. Future Meetings and Agenda Items
 - o Review Agenda Calendar
 - o Identification of future agenda items
 - BAG Committee reduced in size from possible 15 to possible 10.
 - Holland / Morren presentation on August 23 related to properties on RR 1431 and Phillips Ranch
 - The Budget meeting previously scheduled for August 16th will be moved to Monday, August 15th, to accommodate Planning and Zoning Commission, who had previously scheduled a meeting on August 16th in Council Chamber.

13. Adjournment

With no further business, and no objections from Council, Mayor Brugger adjourned the meeting at 12:15 AM.

Approved by City Council on the 9th of August, 2016

By: Carl Brugger
Carl Brugger, Mayor

Attest:

Elaine Simpson
Elaine Simpson, City Secretary

July 26, 2016 Exhibit 'A' City Council Meeting minutes

BURNET CENTRAL APPRAISAL DISTRICT
 P. O. BOX 908 / 223 SOUTH PIERCE
 BURNET, TEXAS 78611
 PHONE (512) 756-8291 - FAX (512) 756-7873

CERTIFICATION OF
 2016 APPRAISAL ROLL
 CITY OF GRANITE SHOALS

I, Stan Hemphill, Chief Appraiser for the Burnet Central Appraisal District, do solemnly swear that the referenced below is that portion of the approved appraisal roll of the Burnet Central Appraisal District which lists property taxable by the City Of Granite Shoals.

2016 Appraisal Roll Information:	<u>2016</u>	<u>2015</u>	Δ
Market Value	\$494,020,047		
Taxable Value	\$467,185,455	459,697,443	7,488,012 <i>or 1.63% increase</i>
Taxable Value-Over-65	\$85,740,382	88,845,731	3,105,349
Value Under Protest	\$1,817,709	958,612	859,097
Owner's Estimate of Value	\$1,454,167		
Adjusted Taxable Value	\$381,081,531	370,163,100	10,918,431
Freeze Levy	\$294,247	294,971	724

2016 Anticipated Collection Rate: 100%
 (Includes Current & Delinquent Tax, Penalty & Interest)

Stan Hemphill
 Stan Hemphill, Chief Appraiser

7/22/2016
 Date

Received By: _____

_____ Date

As soon as possible, please sign and return a copy to our office via fax (512-756-7873), email (stanad@nctv.com), or mail (P O Box 908, Burnet, TX 78611).

Exhibit 'B'

*July 26, 2016
City Council Mtg. minutes*

From: Brad Young BYoung@bickerstaff.com
Subject: PRIVILEGED COMMUNICATION - Transportation User Fees
Date: Today at 10:53 AM
To: Carl Brugger mayor@graniteshoals.org
Cc: Ken Nickel citymanager@graniteshoals.org, Peggy Smith gspw@graniteshoals.org

Mayor,

Here's an excerpt from a memo that a prepared for the City a few years ago that discusses various methods of funding road maintenance and construction:

Revenue Sources that Apply to Streets

1. Street assessments. The Texas Transportation Code provides a mechanism through which a home-rule municipality may require landowners to share in the costs of street improvements that abut the landowners' properties.^[1] Under the statute, the landowner's cost of the improvement may not exceed the amount by which the improvement specially benefits the owner's abutting land by enhancing the land's value.^[2] In addition, the statute permits a home-rule city to adopt its own procedures for imposing assessments.^[3] In October of 2006, the City adopted Ordinance No. 471 to specify the procedures through which the City would impose street assessments.

The state statute does not require the City to obtain the landowner's consent prior to imposing the assessment. Under Ordinance 471, however, the City only will impose an assessment if it receives the approval of 75% of the affected landowners. If the city were to decide to unilaterally impose street assessments, it would need to amend its ordinance.

2. Transportation user fees. A city may impose a "user fee" to recoup its expenses for providing city services.^[4] Some cities, including the City of Austin, charge utility customers a prorated "transportation user fee" to recoup some or all of the city's costs in establishing and maintaining municipal streets and roads.^[5] The Austin ordinance, for example, employs a calculation based on the average number of motor vehicle trips attributable to a particular property and the size and the use of the property in order to prorate the cost of the city's transportation infrastructure costs among users.^[6] Because it assumes that the property owner is actually using the transportation infrastructure, the Austin model only applies to developed acreage.^[7]

There are few reported cases or rulings regarding such user fees generally.^[8] Further, we did not find any authority regarding the legality of transportation user fees such as Austin's. At a minimum, however, it appears that a city would need to attempt (as Austin has) to reasonably tie the amount of the user fee to the actual benefit that the user receives from the particular service. Thus, for example, while the Granite Shoals City Council might be able to reasonably assume a certain number of motor vehicle trips for each utility customer, it probably would not be reasonable for the council to assume that owners of undeveloped lots make a similar number of motor vehicle trips. Further, the Council probably would also need to consider whether the owner of a weekend home makes a similar number of motor vehicle trips over city streets as a full-time resident. All of these considerations would make it difficult for the Council to justify a uniform "per lot" transportation user fee for all lots in the city limits.

3. Impact fees (new construction). An impact fee is a charge or assessment that a city imposes on *new* development in order to fund or recoup the costs of capital improvements or facility expansion necessitated by and attributable to the new development.

^[9] The statute only permits a city to use the revenue derived from impact fees for specific purposes, including the establishment of "roadway facilities" inside the city limits.^[10] In addition, the city may not impose fees to repair or maintain existing development.^[11] Before it can impose impact fees, the statute requires the city to complete a detailed process that includes, among other requirements, the preparation of a "capital improvements plan", the appointment of a capital improvements advisory committee, and notice and public hearing.^[12]

Thanks,
Brad

Bradley B. Young
Attorney

Bickerstaff Heath Delgado Acosta LLP

3711 S. MoPac Expy | Building One | Suite 300 | Austin, TX 78746
Phone 512.472.8021 | Fax 512.320.5638 | www.bickerstaff.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:

The information contained in this transmission may be (1) subject to the Attorney-Client Privilege, (2) attorney work product, or (3) strictly confidential. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, you are notified that you may not disclose, print, copy or disseminate this information. If you have received this transmission in error, please reply and notify the sender (only) and delete the message. Unauthorized interception of this e-mail may be a violation of criminal law.

[1] *See, generally*, TEX. TRANSP. CODE §§ 311.091, *et seq.*

[2] *Id.* at § 311.091(a).

[3] *Id.* at § 311.094.

[4] *See Bexar County v. City of San Antonio*, 352 S.W.2d 905, 906-07 (Tex. Civ. App. – San Antonio 1961, writ dismissed) (sewer infrastructure fee).

[5] *See* CITY OF AUSTIN CODE OF ORDINANCES, Chap. 14-10 (“Transportation User Fee”).

[6] *Id.*

[7] *Id.*

[8] *See* 22 DAVID B. BROOKS, MUNICIPAL LAW & PRACTICE § 9.23 (2d ed. 1999).

[9] TEX. LOC. GOV'T CODE § 391.001(4).

[10] *Id.* at §§ 395.001, 395.011, 395.012. The statute does not permit a city to impose impact fees for the dedication of land for public parks or payment in lieu of the dedication to serve park needs. *Id.* at § 395.001(4)(A).

[11] *Id.* at § 395.013.

[12] *See, generally, id.* at §§ 395.011 *et seq.*

Granite Shoals, Texas
 \$2,600,000 Tax Rate Impact Analysis

26-Jul-16

Page 1

FYE	Assessed Valuation (1)	Existing Debt Serv. (2)	-----\$2,600,000 - 2017 Bonds ----- --- Delivered 2/1/17 - 4.00% (3) --- Principal	Interest	Total	Aggregate Net Tax Supported Debt Service	Estimated I&S Tax Rate (4)	Tax Rate Increase Fm 2016	
2016	370,163,100	875,523				875,523	0.2278		
2017	373,864,731	877,767	165,000	52,000	217,000	1,094,767	0.2988	0.0710	
2018	377,603,378	880,035	230,000	97,400	327,400	1,207,435	0.3263	0.0985	
2019	381,379,412	880,370	240,000	88,200	328,200	1,208,570	0.3234	0.0956	
2020	385,193,206	880,728	250,000	78,600	328,600	1,209,328	0.3204	0.0926	
2021	389,045,138	880,152	260,000	68,600	328,600	1,208,752	0.3170	0.0892	
2022	389,045,138	878,568	270,000	58,200	328,200	1,206,768	0.3165	0.0887	
2023	389,045,138	881,050	280,000	47,400	327,400	1,208,450	0.3170	0.0892	
2024	389,045,138	878,298	290,000	36,200	326,200	1,204,498	0.3159	0.0881	
2025	389,045,138	879,581	300,000	24,600	324,600	1,204,181	0.3158	0.0880	
2026	389,045,138	879,597	315,000	12,600	327,600	1,207,197	0.3166	0.0888	
Totals						2,600,000	563,800	3,163,800	

Data from First Southwest, 7/1/16

- 1) Fiscal year 2015 assessed valuation provided from the City's Budget FY 2015-2016
- 2) Includes Series 2014, 2010 and 2008. Assumes 6.00% increase rate for Series 2010.
- 3) Assumes 4.000% interest rate.
- 4) Tax collection rate of 98%, Actual I&S tax rate for fiscal year 2016.

Granite Shoals, Texas
 \$2,843,500 Tax Rate Impact Analysis

26-Jul-16

Page 2

FYE	Assessed Valuation (1)	Existing Debt Serv. (2)	-----\$2,843,500 - 2017 Bonds ----- --- Delivered 2/1/17 - 4.00% (3) ---	Principal	Interest	Total	Aggregate Net Tax Supported Debt Service	Estimated I&S Tax Rate (4)	Tax Rate Increase Fm 2016
2016	370,163,100	875,523					875,523	0.2278	
2017	373,864,731	877,767	180,453	56,870	237,323		1,115,090	0.3043	0.0765
2018	377,603,378	880,035	251,540	106,522	358,062		1,238,097	0.3346	0.1068
2019	381,379,412	880,370	262,477	96,460	358,937		1,239,307	0.3316	0.1038
2020	385,193,206	880,728	273,413	85,961	359,375		1,240,103	0.3285	0.1007
2021	389,045,138	880,152	284,350	75,025	359,375		1,239,527	0.3251	0.0973
2022	389,045,138	878,568	295,287	63,651	358,937		1,237,505	0.3246	0.0968
2023	389,045,138	881,050	306,223	51,839	358,062		1,239,112	0.3250	0.0972
2024	389,045,138	878,298	317,160	39,590	356,750		1,235,048	0.3239	0.0961
2025	389,045,138	879,581	328,096	26,904	355,000		1,234,581	0.3238	0.0960
2026	389,045,138	879,597	344,501	13,780	358,281		1,237,878	0.3247	0.0969
			2,843,500	616,602	3,460,102				

Data from First Southwest, 7/1/16

- 1) Fiscal year 2015 assessed valuation provided from the City's Budget FY 2015-2016
- 2) Includes Series 2014, 2010 and 2008. Assumes 6.00% increase rate for Series 2010.
- 3) Assumes 4.000% interest rate.
- 4) Tax collection rate of 98%, Actual I&S tax rate for fiscal year 2016.

FYE	Assessed Valuation (1)	Existing Debt Serv. (2)	Principal	Less Cash Fm \$3.50 (5)	Interest	Total	Aggregate Net Tax Supported Debt Service	Estimated I&S Tax Rate (4)	Tax Rate Increase Fm 2016	Tax Rate Compared To No Fee
2016	370,163,100	875,523					875,523	0.2278		
2017	373,864,731	877,767	180,453	(34,094)	56,870	203,229	1,080,996	0.2950	0.0672	(0.0093)
2018	377,603,378	880,035	251,540	(102,283)	106,522	255,780	1,135,815	0.3069	0.0791	(0.0276)
2019	381,379,412	880,370	262,477	(102,283)	96,460	256,655	1,137,025	0.3042	0.0764	(0.0274)
2020	385,193,206	880,728	273,413	(102,283)	85,961	257,092	1,137,820	0.3014	0.0736	(0.0271)
2021	389,045,138	880,152	284,350	(102,283)	75,025	257,092	1,137,244	0.2983	0.0705	(0.0268)
2022	389,045,138	878,568	295,287	(102,283)	63,651	256,655	1,135,223	0.2978	0.0700	(0.0268)
2023	389,045,138	881,050	306,223	(102,283)	51,839	255,780	1,136,830	0.2982	0.0704	(0.0268)
2024	389,045,138	878,298	317,160	(102,283)	39,590	254,467	1,132,765	0.2971	0.0693	(0.0268)
2025	389,045,138	879,581	328,096	(102,283)	26,904	252,717	1,132,298	0.2970	0.0692	(0.0268)
2026	389,045,138	879,597	344,501	(102,283)	13,780	255,998	1,135,595	0.2978	0.0700	(0.0268)
			2,843,500	(954,638)	616,602	2,505,464				

Data from First Southwest, 7/1/16

- 1) Fiscal year 2015 assessed valuation provided from the City's Budget FY 2015-2016
- 2) Includes Series 2014, 2010 and 2008. Assumes 6.00% increase rate for Series 2010.
- 3) Assumes 4.000% interest rate.
- 4) Tax collection rate of 98%, Actual I&S tax rate for fiscal year 2016.
- 5) Fee collection rate of 98%.

CITY OF GRANITE SHOALS - ARTERIAL ROAD REPAYMENT OPTIONS - Rev 1

7/12/2016 BRUGGER

HOME VALUE RANGE	----- DEBT PAYMENT BASED ON TAX RATE INCREASE ONLY, SEE NOTES 1-5 -----					----- USE OF FEE AND TAX RATE INCREASE, NOTES 6-8 -----		
	TOTAL APPRAISED VALUE	NUMBER OF PROPERTY OWNERS	%	AVERAGE VALUE PER OWNER	TAX @ \$0.07881	TOTAL TAX FOR RANGE	EFFECTIVE TAX RATE @ \$0.06210	ADD \$3.50 PER MONTH FEE FOR RANGE
\$0 TO \$25,000	\$ 5,575,785	519	26%	\$ 10,743	\$8	\$ 4,394	2%	\$49 \$ 25,261
\$25,000 TO \$50,000	\$ 9,463,094	256	13%	\$ 36,965	\$29	\$ 7,458	3%	\$65 \$ 16,629
\$50,000 TO \$75,000	\$ 16,015,779	255	13%	\$ 62,807	\$49	\$ 12,622	5%	\$81 \$ 20,656
\$75,000 TO \$100,000	\$ 14,977,086	173	9%	\$ 86,573	\$68	\$ 11,803	4%	\$96 \$ 16,567
\$100,000 TO \$125,000	\$ 14,135,143	127	6%	\$ 111,300	\$88	\$ 11,140	4%	\$111 \$ 14,112
\$125,000 TO \$150,000	\$ 13,153,208	96	5%	\$ 137,013	\$108	\$ 10,366	4%	\$127 \$ 12,200
\$150,000 TO \$175,000	\$ 12,554,146	78	4%	\$ 160,951	\$127	\$ 9,894	4%	\$142 \$ 11,072
\$175,000 TO \$200,000	\$ 6,773,274	36	2%	\$ 188,147	\$148	\$ 5,338	2%	\$159 \$ 5,718
\$200,000 TO \$250,000	\$ 11,274,325	51	3%	\$ 221,065	\$174	\$ 8,885	3%	\$179 \$ 9,143
\$250,000 TO \$300,000	\$ 10,170,067	37	2%	\$ 274,867	\$217	\$ 8,015	3%	\$213 \$ 7,870
\$300,000 TO \$400,000	\$ 30,235,190	86	4%	\$ 351,572	\$277	\$ 23,828	9%	\$260 \$ 22,388
\$400,000 TO \$500,000	\$ 49,418,501	110	5%	\$ 449,259	\$354	\$ 38,947	15%	\$321 \$ 35,309
\$500,000 TO \$600,000	\$ 55,969,742	103	5%	\$ 543,396	\$428	\$ 44,110	17%	\$379 \$ 39,083
\$600,000 TO \$1,000,000	\$ 65,366,372	90	4%	\$ 726,293	\$572	\$ 51,515	20%	\$493 \$ 44,373
GREATER THAN \$1,000,000	\$ 18,218,823	15	1%	\$ 1,214,588	\$957	\$ 14,358	5%	\$796 \$ 11,944
SUB-TOTAL	\$ 333,300,535	\$ 2,032	100%	\$ 164,026		\$ 262,674	100%	\$ 292,324
OV-DP	\$ 95,694,914	453		\$ 211,247				\$42 \$ 19,026
TOTALS	\$ 428,995,449	\$ 2,485		\$ 172,634				\$ 311,350

NOTES

- 1) 61 PROPERTIES LESS THAN \$2,250 IN APPRAISED VALUE, 140 PROPERTIES LESS THAN \$5,000
- 2) 52% OF PROPERTY OWNERS HAVE A TAXABLE VALUE LESS THAN \$75,000 AND PAY LESS THAN 10% OF THE TAXES
- 3) 24% OF PROPERTY OWNERS HAVE A TAXABLE VALUE OVER \$200,000 AND PAY 72% OF THE TAXES
- 4) OV-DP WILL A TOTAL TAXABLE VALUE OF \$95,694,914 WOULD NOT PAY TOWARD ROAD IMPROVEMENTS WITHOUT A MONTHLY FEE
- 5) ANNUAL I&S FOR \$2,589,000 @ 4.5% & 15 YRS IS \$262,674, AS SHOWN ABOVE
- 6) BY ADDING A \$3.50 MONTHLY FEE, DEBT REPAYMENTS FROM PROPERTTY TAXES ARE REDUCED TO \$1,500,000 @ 4.0% & 10 YRS, WITH \$1,000,000 PAID WITH FEES. (DEBT REPAYMENT RATE ON \$2,500,000 FOR 10 YRS IS EQUIVALENT TO A TAX RATE OF \$0.0956 PER \$100)
- 7) ANNUAL I&S FOR \$2,500,000 @ 4.0% & 10 YRS IS \$318,635, AS COMPARED TO \$311,350, AS SHOWN ABOVE.
- 8) FOR THE 52% OF PROPERTY OWNERS WITH A TAXABLE VALUE LESS THAN \$75,000, WHEN SUBJECT TO A \$3.50 FEE, NOW PAY 20% OF THE ROAD IMPROVEMENTS, UP FROM 10%, AND EXEMPT TAXPAYERS NOW PAY 6%.

6/30/2016 Revision #1
 Costs & road measurements from KC Engineering, Inc., Greg Haley, P.E.)
 Mayor - Carl Bruggen

ROAD	CURRENT PROPOSAL			ALTERNATIVE PROPOSAL #2		
	SECTION 1	SECTION 2	SECTION 3	SECTION 1	SECTION 2	SECTION 3
PHILLIPS RANCH ROAD	FM 1431 TO NEWCASTLE	NEWCASTLE TO BLUE-BRIAR DR	BLUEBRIAR TO LIVE OAK	FM 1431 TO NEWCASTLE	NEWCASTLE TO BLUE-BRIAR DR	BLUEBRIAR TO LIVE OAK
LENGTH	4,800 FEET	2,950 FEET	3,440 FEET	4,800 FEET	2,950 FEET	3,440 FEET
COST \$ (W/DITCHES)	\$ 768,000	\$ 472,000	\$ 550,400	\$ 768,000	\$ 472,000	\$ -
PRAIRIE CREEK	FM 1431 TO FORREST HILLS	FORREST HILLS TO SHERWOOD FORREST		FM 1431 TO FORREST HILLS	FORREST HILLS EAST 100 YARDS	
LENGTH	4,963 FEET	1,954 FEET		4,963 FEET	300 FEET	
COST \$ (CURB & GUTTER & STORM SEWER)	\$ 2,038,000			\$ 2,038,000		
COST \$ (W/DITCHES)		\$ 268,000			\$ 48,600	
VALLEY VEIW	FM 1431 TO KINGSOAK	KINGSOAK TO LEEWAY		FM 1431 TO KINGSOAK	KINGSOAK TO LEEWAY	
LENGTH	3,907 FEET	4,171 FEET		3,907 FEET	4,171 FEET	
COST \$ (W/DITCHES)	\$ -	\$ -		\$ 633,000	\$ 676,000	
PROPOSED ROAD IMPROVEMENT COSTS						
DESIGN CONTINGENCY						
PRARIE CREEK WATER LINE						
TOTAL PROJECT COSTS						
FEET PAVED						
FINANCING						
USDA GRANT						
GRANITE SHOALS BONDS						
GRANITE SHOALS FUNDS						
TOTAL FINANCING						
FINANCING - TAXPAYER COSTS (Interpolation of First Southwest information)						
Estimated based on bonds of \$4.5% for 15 years						
FINANCING - TAXPAYER COSTS (SOURCE - FIRST SOUTHWEST 12-1-2015)						
\$1,500,000 @ 4% for 10 Years, I&S rate increase of \$0.0621 / \$100 evaluation, or \$62.10 for a \$100,000 home						
\$1,500,000 @ 4.5% for 15 Years, I&S rate increase of \$0.0506 / \$100 evaluation, or \$50.60 for a \$100,000 home						
\$2,500,000 @ 4% for 10 Years, I&S rate increase of \$0.0956 / \$100 evaluation, or \$95.60 for a \$100,000 home						
\$2,500,000 @ 4.5% for 15 Years, I&S rate increase of \$0.0761 / \$100 evaluation, or \$76.10 for a \$100,000 home						

\$0.07104 / \$100
 \$71.04 / Yr. Estimate

\$0.0634 / \$100
 \$63.35 / Yr. Estimate

\$0.0634 / \$100
 \$63.35 / Yr. Estimate

\$3,046,560
 \$2,242,640
 \$250,000
 \$5,539,200

\$4,096,400
 \$250,000
 \$653,600
 \$5,000,000
 18,107 FEET

\$4,096,400
 \$250,000
 \$653,600
 \$5,000,000
 18,107 FEET

8,078 FEET
 \$1,309,000

8,078 FEET
 \$1,309,000

8,078 FEET
 \$1,309,000

Costs & road measurements from KC Engineering, Inc., Greg Haley, P.E.
Mayor - Carl Brugger

ROAD	CURRENT PROPOSAL			ALTERNATIVE PROPOSAL #3		
	SECTION 1	SECTION 2	SECTION 3	SECTION 1	SECTION 2	SECTION 3
PHILLIPS RANCH ROAD	FM 1431 TO NEWCASTLE	NEWCASTLE TO BLUE-BRIAR DR	BLUEBRIAR TO LIVE OAK	FM 1431 TO NEWCASTLE	NEWCASTLE TO BLUE-BRIAR DR	BLUEBRIAR TO LIVE OAK
LENGTH	4,800 FEET	2,950 FEET	3,440 FEET	4,800 FEET	2,950 FEET	3,440 FEET
COST \$ (W/DITCHES)	\$ 768,000	\$ 472,000	\$ 550,400	\$ 768,000	\$ 472,000	\$ 550,400
PRAIRIE CREEK	FM 1431 TO FORREST HILLS	FORREST HILLS TO SHERWOOD FORREST		FM 1431 TO FORREST HILLS	FORREST HILLS TO SHERWOOD FORREST	
LENGTH	4,963 FEET	1,954 FEET		4,963 FEET	1,954 FEET	
COST \$ (CURB & GUTTER & STORM SEWER)	\$ 2,038,000			\$ 2,038,000		
COST \$ (W/DITCHES)		\$ 268,000			\$ 268,000	
VALLEY VEIV	FM 1431 TO KINGSOAK	KINGSOAK TO LEEWAY		FM 1431 TO KINGSOAK	KINGSOAK TO LEEWAY	
LENGTH	3,907 FEET	4,171 FEET		3,907 FEET	4,171 FEET	
COST \$ (W/DITCHES)	\$ -	\$ -		\$ 633,000	\$ 676,000	
PROPOSED ROAD IMPROVEMENT COSTS						
DESIGN CONTINGENCY						
PRAIRIE CREEK WATER LINE						
TOTAL PROJECT COSTS						
FEET PAVED						
FINANCING						
USDA GRANT						
GRANITE SHOALS BONDS						
GRANITE SHOALS FUNDS						
TOTAL FINANCING						
FINANCING - TAXPAYER COSTS (Interpolation of First Southwest information)						
Estimated based on bonds of \$4.5% for 15 years						
FINANCING - TAXPAYER COSTS (SOURCE - FIRST SOUTHWEST 12-1-2015)						
\$1,500,000 @ 4% for 10 Years, I&S rate increase of \$0.0621 / \$100 evaluation, or \$62.10 for a \$100,000 home						
\$1,500,000 @ 4.5% for 15 Years, I&S rate increase of \$0.0506 / \$100 evaluation, or \$50.60 for a \$100,000 home						
\$2,500,000 @ 4% for 10 Years, I&S rate increase of \$0.0956 / \$100 evaluation, or \$95.60 for a \$100,000 home						
\$2,500,000 @ 4.5% for 15 Years, I&S rate increase of \$0.0761 / \$100 evaluation, or \$76.10 for a \$100,000 home						

\$0.07881 / \$100
\$78.81 / Yr. Estimate

\$0.0634 / \$100
\$63.35 / Yr. Estimate

\$0.0634 / \$100
\$63.35 / Yr. Estimate

Mayor - Carl Brugger

ROAD	CURRENT PROPOSAL			ALTERNATIVE PROPOSAL #2			
	SECTION 1	SECTION 2	SECTION 3	SECTION 1	SECTION 2	SECTION 3	ALL SECTIONS COST & FT. PAVED
PHILLIPS RANCH ROAD	FM 1431 TO NEWCASTLE	NEWCASTLE TO BLUE-BRIAR DR	BLUEBRIAR TO LIVE OAK	FM 1431 TO NEWCASTLE	NEWCASTLE TO BLUE-BRIAR DR	BLUEBRIAR TO LIVE OAK	
LENGTH	4,800 FEET	2,950 FEET	3,440 FEET	4,800 FEET	2,950 FEET	3,440 FEET	7,750 FEET
COST \$ (W/DITCHES)	\$ 768,000	\$ 472,000	\$ 550,400	\$ 768,000	\$ 472,000	\$ -	\$ 1,240,000
PRAIRIE CREEK	FM 1431 TO FORREST HILLS	FORREST HILLS TO SHERWOOD FORREST		FM 1431 TO FORREST HILLS	FORREST HILLS EAST 100 YARDS		
LENGTH	4,963 FEET	1,954 FEET		4,963 FEET	300 FEET		5,263 FEET
COST \$ (CURB & GUTTER & STORM SEWER)	\$ 2,038,000	\$ 268,000		\$ 2,038,000	\$ 48,600		\$ 2,038,000
COST \$ (W/DITCHES)							\$ 48,600
VALLEY VEIW	FM 1431 TO KINGSOAK	KINGSOAK TO LEEWAY		FM 1431 TO KINGSOAK	KINGSOAK TO LEEWAY		
LENGTH	3,907 FEET	4,171 FEET		3,907 FEET	4,171 FEET		8,078 FEET
COST \$ (W/DITCHES)	\$ -	\$ -		\$ 633,000	\$ 676,000		\$ 1,309,000
PROPOSED ROAD IMPROVEMENT COSTS							\$ 4,635,600
DESIGN CONTINGENCY							\$ 250,000
10% OVERALL CONTINGENCY							\$ -
PRARIE CREEK WATER LINE							\$ 653,600
TOTAL PROJECT COSTS							\$ 5,539,200
FEET PAVED							21,091 FEET
FINANCING							
USDA GRANT							\$ 3,046,560
GRANITE SHOALS BONDS							\$ 2,242,640
GRANITE SHOALS FUNDS							\$ 250,000
TOTAL FINANCING							\$ 5,539,200
FINANCING - TAXPAYER COSTS (Interpolation of First Southwest information dated 7/11/2016)							
Estimated additional tax based on bonds of 4.0% for 10 years							0.0775
Rate (2018) per \$100 evaluation							0.0684
Rate (2026) per \$100 evaluation, beyond 2026 other debt service declines							0.0566
Estimated additional tax based on bonds of 4.0% for 15 years							0.0657
Rate (2018) per \$100 evaluation							0.0560
Rate (2026) per \$100 evaluation, beyond 2026 other debt service declines							

CITY OF GRANITE SHOALS - ARTERIAL ROADS 2016

7/26/2016 Revision #2, - Corrected
 Costs & road measurements from KC Engineering, Inc., Greg Haley, P.E.)
 Mayor - Carl Bruggner

ROAD	CURRENT PROPOSAL				ALL SECTIONS COST & FT. PAVED
	SECTION 1	SECTION 2	SECTION 3	SECTION 3	
PHILLIPS RANCH ROAD	FM 1431 TO NEWCASTLE	NEWCASTLE TO BLUE-BRIAR DR	BLUEBRIAR TO LIVE OAK	SECTION 3	ALL SECTIONS COST & FT. PAVED
LENGTH	4,800 FEET	2,950 FEET	3,440 FEET	3,440 FEET	11,190 FEET
COST \$ (W/DITCHES)	\$ 768,000	\$ 472,000	\$ 550,400	\$ 550,400	\$ 1,790,400
PRAIRIE CREEK	FM 1431 TO FORREST HILLS	FORREST HILLS TO SHERWOOD FORREST			
LENGTH	4,963 FEET	1,954 FEET			6,917 FEET
COST \$ (CURB & GUTTER & STORM SEWER)	\$ 2,038,000	\$ 268,000			\$ 2,038,000
COST \$ (W/DITCHES)				\$ 268,000	\$ 268,000
VALLEY VEIW	FM 1431 TO KINGSOAK	KINGSOAK TO LEEWAY			
LENGTH	3,907 FEET	4,171 FEET			8,078 FEET
COST \$ (W/DITCHES)	\$ -	\$ -			\$ 1,309,000
PROPOSED ROAD IMPROVEMENT COSTS					\$ 5,405,400
DESIGN CONTINGENCY					\$ 250,000
10% OVERALL CONTINGENCY					\$ 565,500
PRARIE CREEK WATER LINE					\$ 653,600
TOTAL PROJECT COSTS					\$ 6,874,500
FEET PAVED					26,185 FEET
FINANCING					
USDA GRANT					\$ 3,781,000
GRANITE SHOALS BONDS					\$ 2,843,500
GRANITE SHOALS FUNDS					\$ 250,000
TOTAL FINANCING					\$ 6,874,500
FINANCING - TAXPAYER COSTS (Interpolation of First Southwest information dated 7/11/2016)					
Estimated additional tax based on bonds of \$4.0% for 10 years					0.0775
Rate (2018) per \$100 evaluation					0.0684
Rate (2026) per \$100 evaluation, beyond 2026 other debt service declines					
Estimated additional tax based on bonds of \$4.0% for 15 years					0.0566
Rate (2018) per \$100 evaluation					0.0794
Rate (2026) per \$100 evaluation, beyond 2026 other debt service declines					0.0702